

p. 22

Testimony to the Public Hearing on Raised Bill No. 6486

John DiBiase
17 Newton Street
Meriden, CT. 06450-4414

Thank you Committee on Select Committee on Children Chairs and members for giving me this opportunity to speak regarding Bill 6486. I have mixed feelings about this Bill.

I am here representing the thousands of non custodial fathers who have been systematically discriminated against by our states Family Court Judicial Branch. I just got a call yesterday from a father in Fairfield who had some concerns that he would not be treated fairly by the courts in his upcoming divorce. He had responded to my web site for Divorced men.. www.ctdivorcedmen.com There is no confidence in the fathers of this state that they will or have been treated fairly by the family court system. One father complained to judge Romeo Petroni in Danbury Superior Court that he wasn't being treated fairly by the court. The judges response was the court treats everyone equally. This same judge denied my motion to prevent my ex-wife from taking our son to the Philippine and in the same hearing gave he permission on my motion to allow her the right to take our son out of our country.

[There are a number of judges who are ill suited to family courts and should be removed because of their twenty century anti-father attitudes. It takes two pay checks and two parents to raise a family in the twenty-first century not one.]

While it is good that it provides for support of fathers to improve their lives, we need to level the playing field between First and Second Families, between married and non married families and between custodial and non custodial parents in the realms of child custody and child support.

Family Courts are holding these classes to different standards. Example: Mothers who are ordered to pay child support do not pay the court ordered child support 80 % of the time. Interference with a non custodial parents visitation orders are rarely sanctioned yet fathers who are delinquent in paying their child support are more often than not incarcerated than given the option of paying an arrearage fee. This is contrary to CSE administrators comment at a fatherhood Task Force meeting saying the courts will not incarcerate a father but order him to pay an arrearage sir charge.

When a custodial parents rights are being interfered with the police readily respond but when a non custodial parent complains about access to their children the police say that visitation interference is a civil matter and you should get an attorney and take the matter to the court. Some police say we can't force you child to visit. There is no consistency between one police department and another in regards to enforcing court ordered visitation.

This Bill No. 6486 is ignoring the "Elephant in the Room" It's name is not "Dumbo" It's name is , Judicial Bias, Judicial Tyranny, Gender Bias, Discrimination against Parents with Disabilities and Discrimination against Fathers.

The amendment to Sec. 3. Section 17b-27a of the general statutes ignores the fact that men (fathers) are being systematically segregated from their children and unconstitutionally being made a non custodial parent for the duration of their children's lives without any access to Due Process Law because of the prejudice in Family Courts against fathers. Our no-fault divorce law denies the defendant Due Process because it takes away the ability of the defendant to stop the plaintiff from getting a divorce. Eighty percent of the divorces are filed by women. We need to take the monetary and property incentives out of

getting a divorce. Family court judges give no credit fathers even if they have been the stay at home parent before the action for dissolution and the bonding that has occurred with the minor child prior to the court action.

This Bill No.. 6486 is just perpetuating an already unjust,unconstitutional child support,child custody system. The director of CSE, Charisse Hutton said at a recent Task Force on Fatherhood meeting the" fathers are ordered to pay child support more than 90% of the time and women less than 10 % or Mothers get custody more than 90 % of the time and fathers get custody less than 10 % of the time. These stats were confirmed when our Attorney General stated that the number of fathers paying child support was 94%, he said this on a news 30 broadcast on Deadbeat dads about a year ago. debra.bogstie@nbcuni.com

I suggested to the Task Force on Fatherhood to introduce a Bill requiring judges to complete a Child Custody Determination Factor check list showing what factors were the ones that determined which parent would get custody in a contested case. No Bill was produced.

This Bill 6486 discriminates against married persons when it says that this Bill will increase the ability of fathers to meet the medical needs of their children. Parents of non divorced homes are not held to this standard of having medical insurance for their children. Parents living at the poverty level at the time of their separation usually can't afford medical for their family let alone for their children. Also working second spouses of both the first and second families income should be included in any calculations for child support. It is unjust to require all parents to pay for college or medical insurance regardless of their financial or marital status.

Regarding sec. 46b-215d of the general statutes: Why is the cap for hours worked is at 45 hours per week and not 40 hours per week ? It is good that overtime is not to be considered income for purposes of child support guidelines. How many obligors are working over 40 hours a week. They are lucky to even have a job in this competitive job market. Nation wide the statistics for how much non custodial parents earn is about 85 % earning less than \$10,000 per week.

The statement in sec. 3. Section 17b-27a (1) is not gender neutral, it states The objectives of the initiative is not to give father equal rights or equal treatment but to continue the state's policy of discriminating against fathers in family court matters. Both men and women should be assisted in meeting their obligations in the financial and emotional responsibilities. There should be a public education program and policy education the custodial parent to support the involvement of the non custodial parent in the minor child's life.

John DiBiase
 Child-Father Advocate
 Save Our Kids Parental Alienation Foundation
www.fatherwithoutchristmas.com
 Divorced Men's Association of Connecticut
www.ctdivorcedmen.com